

REMARKS

Claims 2-5, 7-10, 14-18, 20 & 21 are objected to due to informalities. Applicants have amended the claims in accordance with the Examiner's comments. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Claims 30-36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as being directed to a computer program per se which is not statutory subject matter. Applicant has decided to cancel these claims without prejudice in order to expedite prosecution of the present application.

Claims 1, 6, 7, 11-21, 30-32 & 37-39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being unpatentable by Freeny et al (US 7,301,664 B2). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Freeny et al. discloses a storage device which is capable of holding non-displayed and displayed images. Freeny et al., however, does not disclose a control section that controls a temporary storage element to read from a recording medium and to hold image-data according to an order decided by a decision element with the already displayed image data as claimed in claim 1.

As to claims 6, 7 and 12, Freeny et al. fails to disclose or suggests first and second storage elements and control section as claimed in claims 6, 7 and 12.

As to claim 11, Freeny et al. does not teach a method of controlling the temporary storage element to read from the recording medium and to hold image data according to an order decided by a decision element with the already-displayed image data.

As to claim 13, Freeny et al. does not disclose a display condition specifying element displaying at least one representative image data matching the display conditions, while relating it to the selection item, and switching the representative image data.

As to claim 19, Freeny et al. does not disclose a method that uses the display condition specifying element displaying at least one representative image data matching the display conditions, while relating it to the selection item, and switching the representative image data.

In view of the above, applicants submit that Freeny et al. fails to disclose elements of the claims at issue. Accordingly, Freeny et al. cannot anticipate the claims under 35 U.S.C. 102.

Claims 2, 3 and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Freeny et al. in view of Ishii et al. Claims 4, 5 and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Freeny et al. in view of Ishii et al. and further view of Tanimoto (US 2005/0063001). Claim 10 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Freeny et al. in view of Ishii et al. in further view of Tanimoto and further view of Wanda et al.

(US 2005/0128514). These dependent claims should be allowable for the same reasons set forth above with respect to the independent claims, as none of the secondary references overcome the deficiencies of Freeny et al. discussed above.

Claims 22-24, 27, 33-35 & 40-42 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Freeny et al. in view of Wanda et al.

As to claims 22-24, applicants have clarified that the claimed invention is directed to an image printing system having a plurality of image output apparatuses, each apparatus having an input element for inputting image data, an instruction element for instructing by an operator to print out, and a printing element for printing out image data using a printing device. However, neither Freeny et al. nor Wanda et al. discloses or suggests an image printing system having such a plurality of image output apparatuses as claimed.

As to claim 27, applicants have clarified that the claimed invention is directed to an image output method performed by an image printing system having a plurality of image output apparatuses, each apparatus having an input element for inputting image data, an instruction element for instructing by an operator to print out, a printing element for printing out image data using a printing device, and a removal opening corresponding to the printing device. However, neither Freeny et al. nor Wanda et al. discloses or suggests an image output method performed by an image printing system having such a plurality of image output apparatuses as claimed.

As to claims 40-42, these claims are dependant to claims 22-24, respectively.

Therefore, applicants submit these claims should be in condition for allowable for the same reasons set forth above with respect to claims 22-24.

Claims 25, 36 and 43 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Freeny et al. in view of Ishii et al. and in further view of Wanda et al. As to claim 25, applicants have clarified that the claimed invention is directed an image printing system having a plurality of image output apparatuses, each apparatus having an input element for inputting image data, an instruction element for instructing by an operator to print out, a printing element for printing out image data using a printing device, and a removal opening corresponding to the printing device. However, neither Freeny nor Wanda et al. discloses or suggests an image printing system having such a plurality of image output apparatuses as claimed.

Claims 26 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Freeny et al. in view of Ishii et al. in further view of Wanda et al. and in further view of Kuo (US 5,513,013). Applicants believe claim 26 should be in condition for allowance for the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 25.

In view of the above, all of the claims in this case are believed to be in condition for allowance, notice of which is respectfully urged.

Respectfully submitted,
ROSSI, KIMMS & McDOWELL LLP

24 MARCH 2009
DATE

/MARC A. ROSSI/
MARC A. ROSSI
REG. No. 31,923

20609 GORDON PARK SQUARE
SUITE 150
ASHBURN, VA 20147
703-726-6020 (PHONE)
703-726-6024 (FAX)